DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 224 SP 006 999

AUTHOR Nickse, Ruth S.
TITLE How to Change the Schools from Inside: Teachers As Change Agents.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; College School Cooperation; Community Involvement; *Leadership Training; *Organizational Change; Teacher Education; *Teacher Role; *Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the argument that teachers, with appropriate training, can be effective change agents within the school system. Among the reasons listed for teachers assuming leadership roles in change are the following: a) as professionals, they have a vested interest in the schooling process; b) since teachers are members of and identify with the system, they have a sense of prehistory about the school organization; c) teachers are constantly on the scene in the schools, where the action is. Some factors that prevent teachers from changing schools are identified as the role of a teacher-as-a-worker and consequent poor teacher self-image, teacher fear of reprisal from administrators and colleagues, and lack of administrative support for teacher-generated innovation. There are a case study of successful teacher-initiated change and a brief description of the course that prepares teachers for this expanded role. The types of projects teachers choose to implement in a guided practicum in planned change are reported as well as teachers' reactions, both good and bad, to their new role as linking agent between school, com unity, and the department of education in a neighboring college. (Author/JA)

ED 084224

HOW TO CHANGE THE SCHOOLS FROM INSIDE:

TEACHERS AS CHANGE AGENTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Ruth S. Nickse, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
in Project Change
Department of Education
State University at
Cortland, New York

SP 006 959

NOT TO BE DUPLICATED WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

HOW TO CHANGE THE SCHOOLS FROM INSIDE:
TEACHERS AS CHANGE AGENTS

According to John Holt, one powerful force for the introduction of change in our schools is the teachers themselves. He writes, "The proper, the best and indeed the only source of lasting and significant change must be the teacher in the classroom." He continues, "New programs, new materials, and even basic changes in organizational structure will not necessarily bring about healthy growth." And further, he adds, teachers must be given the freedom and support to innovate and this cannot be promoted by (the administrators) "prescribing continuously and in detail what is to be done" (Holt, 1970).

It is the opinion of several educational spokesmen (Featherstone, Weber, Rogers) that a grass roots' movement toward school reform is probably the most effective approach in creating decent schools for children. But the notion that teachers themselves could form a viable group of change agents for the school is seldom mentioned among those most intimately concerned with educational renewal. In fact, little attention is paid in the literature to the role of the teacher as change agent, and schools of education studiously avoid preparing teachers for any but an academic role which is rather narrowly defined by the certification procedures in most states. And, in truth, the role of the teacher is at the bottom of the hierarchy in the educational pecking order. It is also a truism that although teachers make up the bulk of the academic profession, they have precious little input into the

system (Ryan, 1972). This is a gross failure to utilize available resources, as teachers are in a unique position to effect change.

Reasons for Teachers Assuming Leadership Roles in Change

There are several reasons why teachers should be considered, and consider themselves, as logical effectors of planned change. Primarily, their position as inside agents in the school organization gives them several advantages.

First, as professionals they have a vested interest in the schooling process. It is their chosen work, the field they have prepared themselves for, their means of livelihood. Their energies and skills are engaged as well as their time and concern. For the most part, they care about what they do and how they do it and feel a sense of responsibility for their efforts.

Second, since teachers are members of and identify with the system, they have a sense of pre-history about the school organization. They are aware of the norms of their colleagues, their attitudes, values and behavioral responses. They know who is for what and why.

Third, since many teachers live in the communities in which they teach (some big cities are the exception), they also have information concerning the values and attitudes of the community at large. They know or have access to, data concerning educational issues of current or past interest to the community.

And, lastly, teachers are constantly on the scene in the schools, where the action is. They are in the position to initiate planned

change on the basis of need and are available to implement these changes. Each of these factors is an asset to teachers in their roles as change agents.

How does it happen then, that teachers, who are in many ways the logical initiators of new programs and methods in the schools, fail to assume leadership roles in the process of planned change? Some of the more obvious reasons are given below.

Some Factors Which Prevent Teachers From Changing Schools

Prior to the turn of the century teachers received much of their direction for classroom practice from outside sources, principally the community that hired them (Ryan, 1972). And, after the turn of the century, when public pressure demanded that schools adopt the model of "scientific management" promoted by Frederick Taylor in the business world, teachers lost more of their decision-making powers. Since one principal of scientific management justified the taking over (by management) of decisions about the best methods to be used in manufacture, it was not long before teachers were relieved of the burden of finding the best methods for teaching children (Callahan, 1962).

As the role of the school administrator grew in response to the cries for efficiency in school operation, the role of the teacher as decision-maker diminished. And the haste to run the schools along the factory model further removed teachers from assuming a broad sense of responsibility for educational practice. The teacher-as-worker emerged, expected to produce an acceptable product much as the factory

did, and with as narrow a sphere of concern as any member of an assembly-line. Expectations for what the role of the teacher could or should be shrunk as the notion of teachers-as-workers expanded.

Perhaps, it could be speculated, this subsequent narrowing of teachers' roles is a part of the cause for another teacher problem; that of poor self-image. Jersild (1955) noted this as well as feelings of anxiety and loneliness in many teachers with whom he worked. (Teachers still identify with this book indicating that these problems still exist.) These negative reports about self tend to be related to feelings of helplessness and powerlessness which then generate apathetic and passive professional behaviors.

Another major problem faced by teachers that inhibits them from taking leadership roles in change is their fear of reprisal, not only from administrators, but also from their colleagues. Both of these factors loom large in the willingness of teachers to engage in change. Fear of reprisal causes teachers to assume a passive role in the system to avoid being hassled; never to question, suggest, criticize or in any other way draw attention to themselves, for that might result in covert or overt retaliation.

As disturbing as the fear of retaliation is the lack of administrative support for teacher-generated innovation. Teachers speak of administrators who do not actively stand in the way of their assuming leadership roles in the schools, but who abort teacher-generated change by their muteness. Administrative neutrality is considered

as disapproval and teachers read this as negativism.

Further, teacher complacency coupled with defensiveness of a profession that is seemingly under constant attack also interferes with teachers' conceptions of an enlarged professional role. Finally, many times the sheer business of the job leaves little time for questioning or thoughtful analyses of the educational endeavor which might result in an effort toward change.

The factors mentioned above contribute to teachers' lack of initiative in promoting planned change in schools, but these problems have a lesser impact on the situation than the most obvious. That is, teachers do not change schools because they don't know how to approach the job. Ignorance, rather than apathy, is a large part of their problem. And ignorance can be corrected, if we as educators lead the way. As Dwight Allen comments, "Teachers aren't dumb...they're just trained to act that way."

Expanding The Teachers' Skills: The Teacher As Knowledge Worker

As professional educators and teacher trainers, we must take a leadership role in preparing teachers for an expanded role in school systems, to encourage them to seek more responsibility for implementation of their profession; in other words, to train them not to be dumb. Among the several new skills that a professional teacher might be prepared for in the course of in- or pre-service training is that of a student of organizational change. The understanding of, and skills to deal with, formal organizations are generally appropriated by scholars

of industrial development and of the business world. Although we may decry the factory model of schools as inappropriate for children, we cannot ignore the reality that schools operate like factories in many instances (Callahan, 1962). If teachers were aware of the characteristics of schools as factory organizations, they could, perhaps, deal with the schools-as-organizations with more sophistication.

As Peter Drucker (1969) states, we are a society of completely interwoven and interdependent organizations not one of which is viable by itself. The school system is a good example, of course, of an enormous social organization embedded in other complex organizations. In order to operate efficiently within an organizational environment of such complexity, teachers need to become, in Drucker's term, "knowledge workers." A knowledge worker, according to Drucker, is a person who has been trained to use systematically organized knowledge as well as a person who can make knowledge productive in systematic ways. These kinds of skills are of great importance to a change agent, and the knowledge that teachers need to use productively concerns the dynamics of organizational theory. Teachers need to know how systems such as schools operate within this dynamic, as well as the proper problem-solving approach to planned change. It is only through such preparation that teachers can assume the role of change agents with a fair chance of being successful.

However, it is not only the teacher's role within the school that must be expanded. Benjamin DeMott, in a recent article (DeMott, 1973), speaks of the need for the development of new sets of relationships

between institutions normally set apart from each other, and these include the teacher's relationship to parents and to the community at large. This broadened frame of reference must also include the relationship between schools of education and the school systems themselves, as more integrated approaches to educational change are both desirable and necessary. Perhaps the best introduction to the notion that teachers can be most effective agents of educational change is to provide a case study of teachers in action in this new and challenging role.

A Case Study Of Teacher-Initiated Change

The following example is an abbreviated version of a project in school change undertaken by two pre-school teachers who worked together in the same school. The school was located in a racially integrated, low-income neighborhood. The teachers, one black, the other white, were disturbed by the lack of interest the parents of their classes showed towards the school and their children's progress. The teachers surmised, probably correctly, that the parents were "put off" by the school, perhaps because it represented a failure experience for many of them, an experience that they would just as soon forget. Also, they felt parents were intimidated by the school and felt that they viewed the school as an inhospitable place. These parents did not participate in school functions and rarely appeared at parent conferences.

Accordingly, the teachers' objectives were to somehow get the parents involved in a parent volunteer program. The following record

of teacher-initiated change notes the strategies employed by the teachers and the outcomes and effects of their effort.

. . . . . .

Table 1 about here.

. . . . . .

This successful approach to implementing the preliminary stage of parent involvement program appears rather simple and straight forward. This simplicity is deceptive, however, and does not properly reveal the lengthy planning which preceeded these events. To illustrate the difference between what actually happened and what ordinarily happens when teachers initiate change, two approaches to the same problem are related below.

The procedures followed by the teacher-team introduced in the previous example are related in the column headed Planned Change. An alternate (and common) procedure that might have been used by the teachers is presented in the column headed Unplanned Change. Although in each instance the goal is clear, the processes employed by the teachers differ and so, of course, do the outcomes.

. . . . . .

Table 2 about here.

. . . . . .

The case study information related above in the left-hand columns is a natural history record of planned change, as requested by Sarason (1971). The other data in the example (right-hand columns) is a

speculation based on countless observations of unplanned change that goes awry. The planned change example is one illustration of what two teachers accomplished to make their school "a better place for kids." However, teachers can do this most successfully only if they are prepared for the role of change-agent.

Let's assume that teachers could and should initiate planned change in the schools. The question arises: How do we prepare teachers for this expanded role?

The Preparation of Teachers As Change Agents

It is rather unlikely that traditionally trained teachers can operate as change agents, for they have few of the skills which would enable them to fill this role, nor the orientation that such a thing is possible. (Who? Me?) It is only through training in the specifics of organizational dynamics and the process of planned change that they can begin to see the possibilities for challenging the system. Thus, new courses will have to be prepared which will combine both the theoretical aspects of planned change as well as the opportunity to practice the new skills in a guided practicum experience. The case study cited earlier is an example of just such a project carried out while the teachers involved gained course credit toward their Masters' degrees in early childhood education.

The course in which they were enrolled is unique in that it deals with a facet of teacher development usually ignored by traditional training programs. A brief description of both the course content and organization may illustrate some of the important aspects of the experience and

may serve as a guide for the development of other courses of this nature.

To begin with, the course initially concentrates on the teaching profession and the characteristics of teachers, as a clue to the building of effective human relationships which are the basis of grass roots' change in the schools. The course then discusses teachers' rights, for a teacher engaged in change cannot afford to be politically naive. From the study of teachers as a group, the course moves into an examination of the characteristics of formal organizations, including discussions of roles, norms, power, communications networks and the dynamics of formal and informal groups. Next, the course directs itself to the study of schools as organizations, with an examination of each teacher's individual school through a school analysis questionnaire. Finally, the course presents problem-solving approaches to change based on the work of Havelock (1971). Using a step-by-step approach to planned change outlined in his book, the teachers select and implement a change strategy in their own schools.

The approach suggested by Havelock is based on several stages of preparation in the process of change. The teachers in the course learn that the key to change at this level is in good human relationships and the establishment of a well-delineated helping role. Next, students use several techniques of observation and questioning to aid them in diagnosing a need in their own particular school. Then the students survey their particular situation in the light of the

kinds of resources that are at hand, including information on monies available as well as access to the skills and energies of other teachers interested in change. From this data, students begin to plan several possible strategies for achieving their goal and develop their change procedure.

One of the important aspects of the course in terms of its management is that teachers register for it in pairs or even groups from the same school and cooperate on their project. The students are also urged to form a support group in their schools to assist them in achieving their goal, and most do this. The typical "School-Community Committee," as the support group is called, consists of the teachers enrolled in the course, several other teachers at the same grade level back at the school, a couple of interested parents, perhaps a paraprofessional and a school administrator. This committee meets regularly to discuss the educational programs of the school and plans for implementing both long- and short-term goals for the school year. Thus, the planning of the change strategy is divided among interested others and the labor is also divided.

The strength of this kind of procedure includes the fact that the teachers gain not only needed help but also psychological support from the committee which is community-based. The teachers become a link between the course taught at the neighboring college and the public schools in the area. The teachers' roles as linking agents are much like that described by DeMott (1973) as "interface" positions, nourishing communication lines between people and institutions that traditionally have been

separated.

Another important aspect of the teacher-initiated change process should also be mentioned; namely, that consideration must be given to the scale of the change attempted. The goal must be recognized by others in the school system as a desirable one; it must be small enough to be feasible, and the resources must be available to achieve the implementation. However, much can be accomplished within these limitations. The following list of teacher-initiated changes which were generated through this course are listed in the table that follows.

. . . . . .

Table 3 goes here.

. . . . . .

The projects listed in the table above are a sample of the kinds of planned changes teachers have been able to implement in their schools. Their reactions to their new and expanded roles have been varied, of course, and reveal changes in their feelings and attitudes about themselves as people and about their roles as professionals. The comments made by the teachers are informative too, as they express the typical kinds of difficulties that teachers-as-change-agents confront. This sampling of comments from the teachers has been arranged into categories or problems which seemed most common.

Teachers' Reactions to Their Role as Change Agents

The kinds of difficulties which occurred as teachers began to

implement their book learning in schools were not entirely unpredictable. Group discussions in classes seemed to be the best catharsis for the expression of confusion, anger, and hurt feelings that were a result of the teachers making an effort to take leadership roles in their schools. Conversely, the joys of success were also shared in class and played an important part in providing much needed moral support. These kinds of answers were given by teachers when they were asked the question: "What was the most difficult experience you encountered as a change agent?"

1. Hostility and Resentment

"Being shot down (criticized) by the administration for being 'devious' and, would you believe, 'Un-American.'"

"Seeing our ideas for change shattered by a hostile supervisor who also expressly forbid us from presenting our plan to the local Board of Education."

"Being thwarted by our immediate supervisor who ridiculed and belittled us for our attempts to get a badly needed motor program going in our school."

"Having to put up with sarcastic comments of our co-workers in the school."

"Teacher X ordered me to stop making home visits."

2. Bureaucratic Frustrations

"Going through all the proper channels to get something done is so slow."

"Having to give a presentation before an essentially non-functioning, powerless committee."

"Not having enough time to devote to my project."

"Not being able to raise $$ to carry this out."

3. Poor Group Decision-making Skills

"Our committee was too large (12 people) to operate efficiently--we talked alot and complained alot but we could never come to a decision."

4. Poor Timing of an Idea

"Although we showed a filmstrip to the P.T.A. to start them thinking about a creative playground, this was prior to our presentation to the Board. Also, we had no real community input as to the need or worth of the project."

5. Fear of Retaliation

"We felt afraid of the school superintendent--he was really upset when we wrote a letter to the School Board outlining our plans."

"I was afraid to present my plans to the School Board, (Afterwards I couldn't understand my fear, as they were so nice and interested.")

These comments are typical of the kinds of replies teachers made concerning their difficulties in their new roles. There were also very heartening comments made and shared with the class when the question was posed: "What was the most successful strategy you employed in implementing your change?" The replies to this question can also be separated into categories which reveal aspects

of skills teachers developed as they proceeded with their "game plans."

1. Increased Communication

"Developing one-to-one communication with teachers, in the lounge, in the parking lot and in the hall."

"We really made an effort to start speaking to and getting to know better members of our own staff, including other teachers, the principal and the janitors."

"I started smiling at everybody."

"We made our first effort to include others in our discussion (parents, janitors). All we did was ask them and they accepted."

"I called the Board members and asked them to the workshop I was giving. They all accepted and said I was the first teacher to ask them to visit the school."

2. Proper Pre-planning and Timing

"Instead of more talking, we acted on our idea. We devised a new report card form and then introduced the idea."

"We started a 'beautiful junque' pile as the beginnings of our material resource center. It blossomed into materials-making sessions in special areas like math and language arts."

3. Organizational Skills

"We met with the principal as a group rather than as individuals; we outnumbered him!"

"We typed an agenda for our meeting with the principal."

"We had a brainstorming session with the faculty to identify problems, and then we did the same things with the parents' organization. We got lists of concerns that way. Strangely enough grading was the top-rated item for both groups!"

4. Information-Giving

"We gave a presentation of our plans to the Board of Education. They were so impressed they gave us $1,000.00 (without our asking) to implement our idea."

5. Change-by-Example

"I offered to teach science to some of the other teachers' classes. They were reluctant at first, but now several of them are doing it regularly."

And, finally, here are some of the replies these teachers made when asked to express what they had learned about themselves and the process of planned change as a result of their experiences.

I learned that...

"change is slower and more complicated than I thought it would be--I was too impatient."

"I'm capable of implementing change--that was a real shock to me!"

"I'm highly organized and impulsive, I don't hear what others are saying to me, I hurt feelings and lose time by having to stop to make amends. I've learned to listen to others and modify my own plans accordingly."

"there are many people in the school that I didn't know and never bothered to know."

"the new community friends I have made are very willing to give me much support."

"parents will respond, if asked."

"I have to do a lot of pushing (nagging) to get things started."

"I'm learning to forseë unanticipated contingencies."

"I'm really sly and devious when I see it's a way to accomplish my goal."

I learned about the Change Process that...

"You must believe totally in your goal, have all the data, stick to your topic, study each aspect without flinching and then charge ahead!"

"our task was too monumental for us."

"change will happen slowly."

"teachers seem braver and more willing to try something new now."

"change just for change's sake can be half-hearted."

"it is difficult to assess the needs of everyone involved in the change process."

"our community is composed of vastly different backgrounds and that all do not want the same thing from education."

"change takes time and so much effort."

"as a teacher, I do not have to sit back and take anyone's word for anything. I can do or try almost anything I want!"

Conclusion

This case study has attempted to show by example that teachers must be utilized as a primary resource in the process of school reform. For too long teachers have been on the receiving end of the decision-making process, excluded from the planning that is involved in change. When teachers have little part in the procedures that surround the initiating of changes in schools, the success of the change is jeopardized. Research shows that change by fiat is often only half supported resulting in the NIH treatment (Not Invented Here) and the eventual return of the system to the status-quo (Watson and Glaser, 1965).

Teacher trainers and project directors must become aware that increasing teachers' traditional classroom skills is not enough if we then expect our students to miraculously improve the schools by some sleight-of-hand. Training programs must equip teachers with a knowledge of planned change and an adequate background in organizational dynamics. A guided practicum experience, on however small a scale, should be encouraged to enable the student to practice a problem-solving approach to change.

The addition of these kinds of knowledges and skills in the repertoire of teachers benefits several different client systems concerned with the schools. The system itself enlarges its base of active workers versed in and oriented towards, grass roots'

change. From the teachers' point of view, a more active and responsible role in the schools will go a long way towards building a more positive self-image for themselves, increasing their professional posture, and eliminating their day-to-day sense of powerlessness. The community is alerted to constructive and energetic efforts of the teaching faculty which may lead to a more informed and more supportive constituency. Important new links are created between colleges of education, communities and school systems. And, of course, the ultimate benefactors are the children, who desperately need contact with a vital, enthusiastic teaching staff who are able and willing to initiate new programs. It is time to bury the myth that teachers don't care about changing schools. They DO care; they just don't know how. We must teach them how.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Callahan, R. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

DeMott, B. "When the Money Stops: What Lies Beyond for the O.E.?" The Saturday Review of Education, vol. LV, #50, January, 1973; pp. 59-61.

Drucker, P. The Age of Discontinuity. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Havelock, R. A Guide to Innovation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1970.

Holt, J. in My Country School Diary by Gordon, J. New York Dell Books, (revised) 1970.

Jersild, A. When Teachers Face Themselves. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1955 (1970 - 14th edition).

Ryan K. and Cooper, J. Those Who Can Teach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Sarason, S. The Culture of School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Watson, G. and Glaser E. "What We Have Learned About Planning for Change." Management Review, November, 1965; p. 36.

TABLE I

OBJECTIVE: A PARENT INVOLVEMENT PLAN

Strategies for Change	Outcomes and Effects
1. The teachers composed an informal note to parents, suggesting a meeting: a sample note was sent to administrators with a request to meet to discuss the need for informal parent involvement: The meeting was held.	1. The pre-planning stage: initial overture to administrators to inform them of proposed change.
2. an administrator (central office) attempted to block the idea on the basis that the "parents weren't interested"	2. the principal allies himself with teachers and supports them in their plan
3. the teachers used the principal as a buffer between the central office and the Board of Education by channeling letters and requests through the supportive principal	3. the teachers developed better relationship with principal: began to feel effective
4. the teachers composed and sent out an informal parent questionnaire to determine parents' areas of concern	4. there was increased communication between home and school
5. the teachers assembled and tallied results of questionnaire	5. the questionnaire provided input to teachers as to parents' concerns about "so much playing" in school
6. the teachers sent parents an informal note asking if they would enjoy a "rap session" about school	6. the note strengthened communication between teachers and parents: teachers are excited about prospects and plan carefully

TABLE I

7. the teachers set up a meeting date at a time convenient for parents	7. the teachers became aware of parents needs and convenience; initiated activity based on parents' need
8. the teachers picked up parents in own cars to provide transportation	8. the teachers were also able to provide sitters from a volunteer group
9. the teachers utilized parents needs as the content of the meeting	9. the teachers explained the program placing emphasis on pre-school philosophy; this informed the parents and relieved the teachers about "playing" activities in their classrooms
10. an informal meeting with teachers, parents, principal, and balky administrator was held, event a smashing success; teachers had to suggest it was "time to go home"	10. breakthrough in traditional teacher-parent meetings, attendance high and much enthusiasm; balky administrator amazed at success, begins to take credit for the event (to the teachers' glee!)
11. teachers repeated the event two weeks later, this time as a covered dish supper at the parents' request	11. parents took over planning for the event, with the teachers
12. at this second event, teachers and parents explored the notion of parent involvement	12. this meeting increased communication and rapport leading to a more friendly and productive teacher-parent involvement, and a less strained climate; setting the scene for Stage II, an organized plan for parent involvement

TABLE 2

TEACHER-INITIATED CHANGE STRATEGIES

Planned Change WHAT DID HAPPEN	Unplanned Change WHAT COULD HAVE HAPPENED
Teachers	Teachers
---involved administrators initially, even though it ruffled feathers at the Central Office: it resulted in strengthened teacher-principal relationships	---could have become discouraged at the initial reaction and dropped plan immediately
---used "proper channels," but they had immunity through the support of their principal	---could have attempted effort without channels--probably perilous in a tight system
---pre-planned event, based on parents' needs and at their convenience; all possible contingencies were explored beforehand, including transportation and sitters	---could have called a meeting based only on their perception of the situation at an inconvenient time and without concern for transportation and sitters
---communicated through informally worded notes which were friendly and described the event as a "rap session"	---could have sent out formally worded letters describing the event as a "discussion"
---generated the content of the event from the needs questionnaire and returned it to the parents	---could have planned event without asking for parental input and imposed the content
---informally led the meeting, with emphasis on introducing parents to each other, served refreshments, chairs in circle	---could have conducted a formal meeting, with parents seated in rows

---concentrated on building rapport, and did not attempt to discuss parent involvement as this would have been premature in the existing climate

---could have promoted involvement out-of-context as a remote intellectual exercise

RESULT: SUCCESS for Stage I

1. Parents and teachers have become acquainted as persons with a common goal, better education for the kids

2. Communication has been established between parents and teachers, and parents have become acquainted with each other. Information about the teachers' program has been given and parents now at least understand why the children "play" a lot.

3. The climate of the situation has grown "warm" and the scene is now prepared for Stage II, planning a parent involvement program

4. The teachers have gained an increased sense of self-confidence, a hopeful outlook on achieving the objective, enthusiasm to continue initiating change toward a parent involvement program. Teachers said "We couldn't believe that we could do it, but it worked beyond our wildest expectations!"

RESULT: Probable Failure

1. This common strategy probably would have resulted in poor attendance at a dull meeting with little chance for teachers and parents to get acquainted.

2. The parents would probably not have raised their concerns and would have remained upset and ignorant of the program at the school.

3. Communications and rapport would have further deteriorated, and the climate of the situation would have remained "cold." There probably would have been no response or a weak response to the suggestion for parent involvement.

4. For the teachers, there would be feelings of disappointment, exasperation, and a hopeless outlook for the objective. Teachers would be heard to say, "We tried to get the parents involved, but they weren't interested--it didn't work."

TABLE 3

TEACHER-INITIATED PROJECTS

Teachers used these strategies...	to achieve these outcomes...	
INCREASED COMMUNICATION THROUGH		
letters to parents, school board members, newsletters, bulletin boards, articles, and picture stories in newspapers; dissemination of educational materials, articles, books, films	*opening up classrooms	establishing motor-development programs for kindergarten
	*phase-in program for parents and kids entering school for the first time	*developing new elementary science curriculum
INCREASED INFORMATION THROUGH		
inter and intra school workshops; visits to other schools; teacher study groups; speakers; and discussion groups; joint attendance at conferences	*building adventure and pocket playgrounds	*beginning parents and senior citizens volunteer program
	*organized mother's clubs for materials for classrooms	*neighborhood discussion groups for the study of child development
INCREASED RAPPORT THROUGH		
informal and formal meetings with parents and teachers through home visits, tureen suppers, grade level dinner parties for kids and parents; mother's clubs, parent-teacher toy making nights; fund raising nights	*recruiting, campaigning for change-oriented school board members	*home visits for individualization of instruction
	*pre-kindergarten assessment programs-also changes in reporting systems	*writing proposals for multi-graded primary program (funded)